MOTION UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 2255 TO VACATE, SET ASIDE, OR CORRECT SENTENCE BY A PERSON IN FEDERAL CUSTODY

Paul Volkman Place of Confinement: USP Coleman I Prisoner No.: 19519424	Juited States District Court	District			
Movant (include name under which you were convicted) Name and location of court that entered the judgment of conviction you are challenging:	Name (under which you were convicted): Paul Volkman		Docket	or Case No.:	
MOTION (a) Name and location of court that entered the judgment of conviction you are challenging:	Place of Confinement: USP Coleman I	-			
MOTION (a) Name and location of court that entered the judgment of conviction you are challenging:	INITED STATES OF AMERICA	Mova	int (include name u	nder which you were	convicted)
(a) Name and location of court that entered the judgment of conviction you are challenging: (b) Criminal docket or case number (if you know): (a) Date of the judgment of conviction (if you know): (b) Date of sentencing: Length of sentence: Nature of crime (all counts): (a) What was your plea? (Check one) (b) If you entered a guilty plea to one count or indictment, and a not guilty plea to another count or indictment, what did you plead not guilty to?	ν.				
(a) Name and location of court that entered the judgment of conviction you are challenging: (b) Criminal docket or case number (if you know): (a) Date of the judgment of conviction (if you know): (b) Date of sentencing: Length of sentence: Nature of crime (all counts): (a) What was your plea? (Check one) (b) If you entered a guilty plea to one count or indictment, and a not guilty plea to another count or indictment, what did you plead not guilty to?	· MO	rion			
(a) Date of the judgment of conviction (if you know): (b) Date of sentencing: Length of sentence: Nature of crime (all counts): (a) What was your plea? (Check one) (b) Date of sentencing: (c) County		•	conviction vou	ara challanging	.
(a) Date of the judgment of conviction (if you know): (b) Date of sentencing: Length of sentence: Nature of crime (all counts): (a) What was your plea? (Check one) (b) If you entered a guilty plea to one count or indictment, and a not guilty plea to another count or indictment, what did you plead guilty to and what did you plead not guilty to?	(a) 1-12-10 and 10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-1	Judgment of	conviction you	are chanengme	š· ———
(a) Date of the judgment of conviction (if you know): (b) Date of sentencing: Length of sentence: Nature of crime (all counts): (a) What was your plea? (Check one) (b) If you entered a guilty plea to one count or indictment, and a not guilty plea to another count or indictment, what did you plead guilty to and what did you plead not guilty to?					
(a) Date of the judgment of conviction (if you know): (b) Date of sentencing: Length of sentence: Nature of crime (all counts): (a) What was your plea? (Check one) (b) If you entered a guilty plea to one count or indictment, and a not guilty plea to another count or indictment, what did you plead guilty to and what did you plead not guilty to?		-			
(a) What was your plea? (Check one) (1) Not guilty (2) Guilty (3) Nolo contendere (no contest) (b) If you entered a guilty plea to one count or indictment, and a not guilty plea to another count or indictment, what did you plead guilty to and what did you plead not guilty to?					
Length of sentence: Nature of crime (all counts): (a) What was your plea? (Check one) (b) If you entered a guilty plea to one count or indictment, and a not guilty plea to another count or indictment, what did you plead guilty to and what did you plead not guilty to?	(a) Date of the judgment of conviction (if you know	10w):			
Length of sentence: Nature of crime (all counts): (a) What was your plea? (Check one) (b) If you entered a guilty plea to one count or indictment, and a not guilty plea to another count or indictment, what did you plead guilty to and what did you plead not guilty to?	(b) Date of sentencing:				2016
Nature of crime (all counts): (a) What was your plea? (Check one) (1) Not guilty (2) Guilty (3) Nolo contendere (no contest) (b) If you entered a guilty plea to one count or indictment, and a not guilty plea to another count or indictment, what did you plead guilty to and what did you plead not guilty to?				- 1 CA	SE
(a) What was your plea? (Check one) (1) Not guilty (2) Guilty (3) Nolo contendere (no contest) (b) If you entered a guilty plea to one count or indictment, and a not guilty plea to another count or indictment, what did you plead guilty to and what did you plead not guilty to?				and the second	-0
(a) What was your plea? (Check one) (1) Not guilty (2) Guilty (3) Nolo contendere (no contest) (b) If you entered a guilty plea to one count or indictment, and a not guilty plea to another count or indictment, what did you plead guilty to and what did you plead not guilty to?					<u> </u>
(a) What was your plea? (Check one) (1) Not guilty (2) Guilty (3) Nolo contendere (no contest) (b) If you entered a guilty plea to one count or indictment, and a not guilty plea to another count or indictment, what did you plead guilty to and what did you plead not guilty to?					
(1) Not guilty (2) Guilty (3) Nolo contendere (no contest) (b) If you entered a guilty plea to one count or indictment, and a not guilty plea to another count or indictment, what did you plead guilty to and what did you plead not guilty to?			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		<u>∵</u>
(1) Not guilty (2) Guilty (3) Nolo contendere (no contest) (b) If you entered a guilty plea to one count or indictment, and a not guilty plea to another count or indictment, what did you plead guilty to and what did you plead not guilty to?					
(1) Not guilty (2) Guilty (3) Nolo contendere (no contest) (b) If you entered a guilty plea to one count or indictment, and a not guilty plea to another count or indictment, what did you plead guilty to and what did you plead not guilty to?	(a) What was your plea? (Check one)				
(b) If you entered a guilty plea to one count or indictment, and a not guilty plea to another count or indictment, what did you plead guilty to and what did you plead not guilty to?		n (n)	NT 1		\ -
or indictment, what did you plead guilty to and what did you plead not guilty to?	•	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		· ·	
	·				
	or indictment, what did you plead guilty to and	what did you	plead not guilt	y to?	
		•			
	•				
f you went to trial, what kind of trial did you have? (Check one) Jury Judge only					
f you went to trial, what kind of trial did you have? (Check one) Jury Judge only			····		
	f you went to trial, what kind of trial did you ha	ave? (Check or	ne) Jury	☐ Judge or	nly 🗆

,	7. I	Did you testify at a pretrial hearing, trial, or post-trial hearing?	Yes		No (_
8	3. I	Did you appeal from the judgment of conviction?	Yes	0	No l	ם
9). I:	f you did appeal, answer the following:				
	(8	a) Name of court:				
	(l	b) Docket or case number (if you know):				
	(0	c) Result:				,
	(d	d) Date of result (if you know):				
		e) Citation to the case (if you know):				•
		Grounds raised:				
	_	<u> </u>				
	_					
	_	·				
	(g)) Did you file a petition for certiorari in the United States Suprem		?	Yes □	No □
		If "Yes," answer the following:				
		(1) Docket or case number (if you know):				
		(2) Result:				
		(3) Date of result (if you know):	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
		(4) Citation to the case (if you know):				
		(5) Grounds raised:				•
10.	Oth	ner than the direct appeals listed above, have you previously filed	any oth	ner m	otions	
		itions, or applications concerning this judgment of conviction in a	_		,	
		Yes O No O	_, ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	••		
11.	If y	our answer to Question 10 was "Yes," give the following informat:	ion:			
		(1) Name of court:				
		(2) Docket or case number (if you know):				
		(3) Date of filing (if you know):				

(4) Nature of the proceeding:
(5) Grounds raised:
(6) Did you receive a hearing where evidence was given on your motion, petition, or
application? Yes O No O
(7) Result:
(8) Date of result (if you know):
(b) If you filed any second motion, petition, or application, give the same information:
(1) Name of court:
(2) Docket or case number (if you know):
(3) Date of filing (if you know):
(4) Nature of the proceeding:
(5) Grounds raised:
(6) Did you receive a hearing where evidence was given on your motion, petition, or
application? Yes D No D
(7) Result:
(8) Date of result (if you know):
(c) Did you appeal to a federal appellate court having jurisdiction over the action taken on you
motion, petition, or application?
(1) First petition: Yes \(\simeg \) No \(\simeg \)
(2) Second natition: Von D. No. D.

Page 4

12. For this motion, state every ground on which you claim that you are being held in violation of the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States. Attach additional pages if you have more than four grounds. State the facts supporting each ground. GROUND ONE: Ineffective assistance of trial counsel for failure to present an affirmative defense (a) Supporting facts (Do not argue or cite law. Just state the specific facts that support your claim.): Counsel failed to present the affirmative defense of the legality of Movant's medical practice and legitimacy of Movant's prescriptions under the Ohio Intractable Pain Treatment Act. The evidence at trial included i) Movant strict enforcement of documentation requirements, 2) frequent drug testing of patients, 3) thorough examinations and 1) whole patient care, all which tends to prove prescription legitimacy within a doctor/patient relationship. The only evidence of Movant's alleged failures to adequately exam were rendered talse by impeachment and aidence of subornation of perjury thad trial counsel presented the affirmative defense, Movant would have neen acquitted of violations of the Controlled Substances Act, which
Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States. Attach additional pages if you have more than four grounds. State the facts supporting each ground. GROUND ONE: Treffective assistance of trial counsel for failure to present an affirmative defense (a) Supporting facts (Do not argue or cite law. Just state the specific facts that support your claim.): Counsel failed to present the affirmative defense of the legality of Movart's medical practice and legitimacy of Movart's prescriptions under the Dhip Intractable Pain Treatment Act. The evidence at malincluded i) Movart strict enforcement of documentation requirements, 2) frequent drug testing of patients, 3) thorough examinations, and 4) whole patient care, all which tends to prove prescription legitimacy within a doctor/patient relationship. The only evidence of Movart's alleged failures to adequately exam were rendered talse by impeachment and aidence of subornation of perjury. Had trial counsel presented the affirmative defense, Movart would have heen acquitted of violations of the Controlled Substances Act, which
Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States. Attach additional pages if you have more than four grounds. State the facts supporting each ground. GROUND ONE: Treffective assistance of trial counsel for failure to present an affirmative defense (a) Supporting facts (Do not argue or cite law. Just state the specific facts that support your claim.): Counsel failed to present the affirmative defense of the legality of Movart's medical practice and legitimacy of Movart's prescriptions under the Dhip Intractable Pain Treatment Act. The evidence at malincluded i) Movart strict enforcement of documentation requirements, 2) frequent drug testing of patients, 3) thorough examinations, and 4) whole patient care, all which tends to prove prescription legitimacy within a doctor/patient relationship. The only evidence of Movart's alleged failures to adequately exam were rendered talse by impeachment and aidence of subornation of perjury. Had trial counsel presented the affirmative defense, Movart would have heen acquitted of violations of the Controlled Substances Act, which
Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States. Attach additional pages if you have more than four grounds. State the facts supporting each ground. GROUND ONE: Treffective assistance of trial counsel for failure to present an affirmative defense (a) Supporting facts (Do not argue or cite law. Just state the specific facts that support your claim.): Counsel failed to present the affirmative defense of the legality of Movart's medical practice and legitimacy of Movart's prescriptions under the Dhip Intractable Pain Treatment Act. The evidence at malincluded i) Movart strict enforcement of documentation requirements, 2) frequent drug testing of patients, 3) thorough examinations, and 4) whole patient care, all which tends to prove prescription legitimacy within a doctor/patient relationship. The only evidence of Movart's alleged failures to adequately exam were rendered talse by impeachment and aidence of subornation of perjury. Had trial counsel presented the affirmative defense, Movart would have heen acquitted of violations of the Controlled Substances Act, which
GROUND ONE: Ineffective assistance of trial counsel for failure to present an affirmative defense (a) Supporting facts (Do not argue or cite law. Just state the specific facts that support your claim.): Counsel failed to present the affirmative defense of the legality of Movant's medical practice and legitimacy of Movant's prescriptions under the Dhio Intractable Pain Treatment Act. The evidence at trial included i) Movant's strict enforcement of documentation requirements, 2) frequent drug testing of patients, 3) thorough examinations, and 4) whole patient care, all which tends to prove prescription legitimacy within a doctor/patient relationship. The only evidence of Movant's alleged failures to adequately exam were rendered talse by impeachment and aidence of subornation of perjury. Had trial counsel presented the affirmative defense, Movant would have lacen acquitted of violations of the Controlled Substances Act, which
GROUND ONE: Ineffective assistance of trial counsel for failure to present an affirmative defense (a) Supporting facts (Do not argue or cite law. Just state the specific facts that support your claim.): Counsel failed to present the affirmative defense of the legality of Movant's medical practice and legitimacy of Movant's prescriptions under the Ohio Intractable Pain Treatment Act. The evidence at trial included 1) Movant's strict enforcement of documentation requirements, 2) frequent drug testing of patients, 3) thorough examinations, and 4) whole patient care, all which tends to prove prescription legitimacy within a doctor/patient relationship. The only evidence of Movant's alleged failures to adequately exam were rendered false by impeachment and aidence of subornation of perjury. Had trial counsel presented the affirmative defense, Movant would have been acquitted of violations of the Controlled Substances Act, which
(a) Supporting facts (Do not argue or cite law. Just state the specific facts that support your claim.): Counsel failed to present the affirmative defense of the legality of Movant's medical practice and legitimacy of Movant's prescriptions under the Dhio Intractable Pain Treatment Act. The evidence at thial included I) Movant strict enforcement of documentation requirements, 2) frequent drug testing of patients, 3) thorough examinations, and 4) whole patient care, all which tends to prove prescription legitimacy within a doctor/patient relationship. The only evidence of Movant's alleged failures to adequately exam were rendered false by impeachment and aidence of subornation of perjury. Had trial counsel presented the affirmative defense, Movant would have been acquitted of violations of the Controlled Substances Act, which
(a) Supporting facts (Do not argue or cite law. Just state the specific facts that support your claim.): Counsel failed to present the affirmative defense of the legality of Movant's medical practice and legitimacy of Movant's prescriptions under the Dhio Intractable Pain Treatment Act. The evidence at trial included I) Movant's strict enforcement of documentation requirements, 2) frequent drug testing of patients, 3) thorough examinations, and 4) whole patient care, all which tends to prove prescription legitimacy within a doctor/patient relationship. The only evidence of Movant's alleged failures to adequately exam were rendered false by impeachment and aidence of subornation of perjury. Had trial counsel presented the affirmative defense, Movant would have been acquitted of violations of the Controlled Substances Act, which
Counsel failed to present the affirmative defense of the legality of Movant's medical practice and legitimacy of Movant's prescriptions under the Ohio Intractable Pain Treatment Act. The evidence at trial included i) Movant's strict enforcement of documentation requirements, 2) frequent drug testing of patients, 3) thorough examinations, and 4) whole patient care, all which tends to prove prescription legitimacy within a doctor/patient relationship. The only evidence of Movant's alleged failures to adequately exam were rendered false by impeachment and aidence of subornation of perjury. Had trial counsel presented the affirmative defense, Movant would have been acquitted of violations of the Controlled Substances Act, which
Movant's medical practice and legitimacy of Movant's prescriptions under the Dhip Intractable Pain Treatment Act. The evidence at trial included 1) Movant's strict enforcement of documentation requirements, 2) frequent drug testing of patients, 3) thorough examinations, and 4) whole patient care, all which tends to prove prescription legitimacy within a doctor/patient relationship. The only evidence of Movant's alleged failures to adequately exam were rendered false by impeachment and aidence of subornation of perjury. Had trial coursel presented the affirmative defense, Movant would have been acquitted of violations of the Controlled Substances Act, which
Movant's medical practice and legitimacy of Movant's prescriptions under the Dhip Intractable Pain Treatment Act. The evidence at trial included 1) Movant's strict enforcement of documentation requirements, 2) frequent drug testing of patients, 3) thorough examinations, and 4) whole patient care, all which tends to prove prescription legitimacy within a doctor/patient relationship. The only evidence of Movant's alleged failures to adequately exam were rendered false by impeachment and aidence of subornation of perjury. Had trial coursel presented the affirmative defense, Movant would have been acquitted of violations of the Controlled Substances Act, which
the Ohio Intractable Pain Treatment Act. The evidence at trial included 1) Movant ! strict enforcement of documentation requirements, 2) frequent drug testing of patients, 3) thorough examinations, and 4) whole patient care, all which tends to prove prescription legitimacy within a doctor/patient relationship. The only evidence of Movant's alleged failures to adequately exam were rendered false by impeachment and aidence of subornation of perjury. Had trial counsel presented the affirmative defense, Movant would have been acquitted of violations of the Controlled Substances Act, which
strict enforcement of documentation requirements, 2) frequent drug testing of patients, 3) thorough examinations, and 4) whole patient care, all which tends to prove prescription legitimacy within a doctor/patient relationship. The only evidence of Movant's alleged failures to a dequately exam were rendered false by impeachment and aidence of subornation of perjury. Had trial counsel presented the affirmative defense, Movant would have been acquitted of violations of the Controlled Substances Act, which
patients, 3) thorough examinations, and 4) whole patient care, all which tends to prove prescription legitimacy within a doctor/patient relationship. The only evidence of Movant's alleged failures to adequately exam were rendered false by impeachment and aidence of subornation of perjury. Had trial counsel presented the affirmative defense, Movant would have been acquitted of violations of the Controlled Substances Act, which
The only evidence of Movant's alleged failures to adequately exam were rendered false by impeachment and aidence of subornation of perjury. Had trial counsel presented the affirmative defense, Movant would have been acquitted of violations of the Controlled Substances Act, which
The only evidence of Movant's alleged failures to adequately exam were rendered false by impeachment and aidence of subornation of perjury. Had trial counsel presented the affirmative defense, Movant would have been acquitted of violations of the Controlled Substances Act, which
Had trial counsel presented the affirmative defense, Movant would have been acquitted of violations of the Controlled Substances Act, which
heen acquitted of violations of the Controlled Substances Act, which
been acquitted of violations of the Controlled Substances Act, which
exempts legitimate medical prescribers from drug trafficking liability.
(b) Direct Appeal of Ground One:
(1) If you appealed from the judgment of conviction, did you raise this issue?
Yes 🗅 No 🗅
(2) If you did not raise this issue in your direct appeal, explain why:
(c) Post-Conviction Proceedings:
(1) Did you raise this issue in any post-conviction motion, petition, or application?
Yes 🗅 No 🗅
(2) If your answer to Question (c)(1) is "Yes," state:
Type of motion or petition:
Name and location of the court where the motion or petition was filed:

Result (at	e court's decision: cach a copy of the court's opinion or order, if available):
	and a copy of the courts opinion of order, it available).
(3) Did you	receive a hearing on your motion, petition, or application?
Yes 🗅	No □
(4) Did you	appeal from the denial of your motion, petition, or application?
Yes 🗅	No 🗅
(5) If your	answer to Question (c)(4) is "Yes," did you raise this issue in the appeal?
. Yes 🚨	No 🗅
(6) If your	answer to Question (c)(4) is "Yes," state:
Name and	location of the court where the appeal was filed:
Docket or c	ase number (if you know):
	court's decision:
	ach a copy of the court's opinion or order, if available):
•	
(7) If your a	answer to Question (c)(4) or Question (c)(5) is "No," explain why you did not app
	enswer to Question (c)(4) or Question (c)(5) is "No," explain why you did not app
	enswer to Question (c)(4) or Question (c)(5) is "No," explain why you did not app
	enswer to Question (c)(4) or Question (c)(5) is "No," explain why you did not app
raise this is	enswer to Question (c)(4) or Question (c)(5) is "No," explain why you did not app sue:
raise this is	inswer to Question (c)(4) or Question (c)(5) is "No," explain why you did not appose to Question (c)(4) or Question (c)(5) is "No," explain why you did not appose to Question (c)(5) is "No," explain why you did not appose to Question (c)(5) is "No," explain why you did not appose to Question (c)(5) is "No," explain why you did not appose to Question (c)(5) is "No," explain why you did not appose to Question (c)(5) is "No," explain why you did not appose to Question (c)(5) is "No," explain why you did not appose to Question (c)(5) is "No," explain why you did not appose to Question (c)(5) is "No," explain why you did not appose to Question (c)(5) is "No," explain why you did not appose to Question (c)(5) is "No," explain why you did not appose to Question (c)(5) is "No," explain why you did not appose to Question (c)(5) is "No," explain why you did not appose to Question (c)(5) is "No," explain why you did not appose to Question (c)(5) is "No," explain why you did not appose to Question (c)(5) is "No," explain why you did not appose to Question (c)(5) is "No," explain why you did not appose to Question (c)(6) is "No," explain why you did not appose to Question (c)(6) is "No," explain why you did not appose to Question (c)(6) is "No," explain why you did not appose to Question (c)(6) is "No," explain why you did not appose to Question (c)(6) is "No," explain why you did not appose to Question (c)(6) is "No," explain why you did not appose to Question (c)(6) is "No," explain why you did not appose to Question (c)(6) is "No," explain why you did not appose to Question (c)(6) is "No," explain why you did not appose to Question (c)(6) is "No," explain why you did not appose to Question (c)(6) is "No," explain why you did not appose to Question (c)(6) is "No," explain why you did not appose to Question (c)(6) is "No," explain why you did not appose to Question (c)(6) is "No," explain why you did not explain (c)(6) is "No,"
und Two	enswer to Question (c)(4) or Question (c)(5) is "No," explain why you did not appose. Distribution assistance of trial counsel for failure a defense of entrapment by estoppe
UND TWO	enswer to Question (c)(4) or Question (c)(5) is "No," explain why you did not approximately explain why approximat
UND TWO SEATH upporting this pro	enswer to Question (c)(4) or Question (c)(5) is "No," explain why you did not approved. D: Ineffective assistance of tralcounsel for failure defense of entrapment by estoppe l'acts (Do not argue or cite law. Just state the specific facts that support your cactice of meditine. Movant adhered to the provis
UND TWO SEAT H upporting this pro	enswer to Question (c)(4) or Question (c)(5) is "No," explain why you did not appose is in the factive assistance of that counsel for failure adefense of entrapment by estoppe leacts (Do not argue or cite law. Just state the specific facts that support your cactice of medicine, Movant adhered to the provision Intractable Pain Treatment Act, whose provision
UND TWO SENT H upporting the Oni	enswer to Question (c)(4) or Question (c)(5) is "No," explain why you did not approved to the assistance of trial counsel for failure the defense of entrapment by estoppe leacts (Do not argue or cite law. Just state the specific facts that support your cactice of medicine. Movantadhered to the provision Intractable Pain Treatment Act, whose provision of the pro
UND TWO SENT H upporting the Onit	enswer to Question (c)(4) or Question (c)(5) is "No," explain why you did not approximate the specific facts that support your cacts (Do not argue or cite law. Just state the specific facts that support your cacts confirmed to the provision of
und Two sent H upporting this pro He Oni	enswer to Question (c)(4) or Question (c)(5) is "No," explain why you did not approximately ensured to the property of the defense of entrapment by estoppe I facts (Do not argue or cite law. Just state the specific facts that support your cachice of medicine. Movant adhered to the provise of Intractable Pain Treatment Act, whose provision of the direct professionals by the federal Drugent Agency of the United States the plaint

b) Direct App	eal of Ground Two:
(1) If you ap	pealed from the judgment of conviction, did you raise this issue?
Yes 🗅	No □
(2) If you di	d not raise this issue in your direct appeal, explain why:
e) Post-Convi	ction Proceedings:
(1) Did you	raise this issue in any post-conviction motion, petition, or application?
Yes 🗅	No □
(2) If your a	nswer to Question (c)(1) is "Yes," state:
Type of mot	on or petition:
Name and lo	cation of the court where the motion or petition was filed:
Docket or ca	se number (if you know):ourt's decision:
Docket or ca	se number (if you know):
Docket or ca Date of the c	se number (if you know):ourt's decision:
Docket or ca Date of the c Result (attack (3) Did you r	se number (if you know): ourt's decision: h a copy of the court's opinion or order, if available):
Docket or ca Date of the c Result (attack (3) Did you r Yes	se number (if you know): ourt's decision: h a copy of the court's opinion or order, if available): eccive a hearing on your motion, petition, or application?
Docket or ca Date of the c Result (attack (3) Did you r Yes	se number (if you know): ourt's decision: h a copy of the court's opinion or order, if available): eceive a hearing on your motion, petition, or application? No ppeal from the denial of your motion, petition, or application?
Docket or ca Date of the co Result (attace (3) Did you r Yes □ (4) Did you a Yes □	se number (if you know):
Docket or ca Date of the of Result (attack (3) Did you r Yes (4) Did you a Yes (5) If your an Yes	se number (if you know):
Docket or ca Date of the of Result (attack (3) Did you r Yes (4) Did you a Yes (5) If your an Yes (6) If your an	se number (if you know):
Docket or ca Date of the or Result (attack (3) Did you r Yes (4) Did you a Yes (5) If your an Yes (6) If your an Name and lock	see number (if you know):
Docket or ca Date of the or Result (attack (3) Did you r Yes (4) Did you a Yes (5) If your an Name and loc Docket or case	se number (if you know):

(7) If your answer to Question (c)(4) or Question (c)(5) is "No," explain why you did not appeal or
raise this issue:
GROUND THREE: Ineffective assistance of trial counsel for failure
to move for mistrial after prejudicial instances of judicial misconduct
(a) Supporting facts (Do not argue or cite law. Just state the specific facts that support your claim.): Instances of judicial misconductincluded Dknowing subornation
of perjury, 2) refusing to admitavailable impeachment evidence of the
living status of Movant's patient following perjured testimony of patient's clearly, 3) use of coerced admissions and unsubstantiated indictment
allegations in jury deliberations after pre-trial ruling to the contrary, 4) failure
to voirdire the jury after likely contamination by public speech on
evils of prescription drug abuse, 5) failure to allow cross-examination
regarding qualifications of experts inviolation of Daubert, and 6) failure to
direct a verdict for acquittal after admitting no evidence of personal profit
when "drugs for money" is a required element of every drug trafficking conviction
(b) Direct Appeal of Ground Three:
(1) If you appealed from the judgment of conviction, did you raise this issue?
Yes 🔾 No 🔾
(2) If you did not raise this issue in your direct appeal, explain why:
(c) Post-Conviction Proceedings:
(1) Did you raise this issue in any post-conviction motion, petition, or application?
Yes O No O
(2) If your answer to Question (c)(1) is "Yes," state:
Type of motion or petition:
Name and location of the court where the motion or petition was filed:
Docket or case number (if you know):
Date of the court's decision:

Page 9

b)	Direct Appeal of Ground Four:
	(1) If you appealed from the judgment of conviction, did you raise this issue?
	Yes 🗆 No 🗅
	(2) If you did not raise this issue in your direct appeal, explain why:
	Post-Conviction Proceedings:
	 Did you raise this issue in any post-conviction motion, petition, or application? Yes □ No □
	(2) If your answer to Question (c)(1) is "Yes," state:
	Type of motion or petition:
	Name and location of the court where the motion or petition was filed:
1	Docket or case number (if you know):
	Docket or case number (if you know):
1	Date of the court's decision:
1	Date of the court's decision:
1	Date of the court's decision:
I -	Date of the court's decision:
I I -	Date of the court's decision:
II - - ((Date of the court's decision: Result (attach a copy of the court's opinion or order, if available): B) Did you receive a hearing on your motion, petition, or application? Yes No
II - - ((Date of the court's decision: Result (attach a copy of the court's opinion or order, if available): B) Did you receive a hearing on your motion, petition, or application?
H (3)	Date of the court's decision: Result (attach a copy of the court's opinion or order, if available): B) Did you receive a hearing on your motion, petition, or application? Yes No 1) Did you appeal from the denial of your motion, petition, or application? Yes No
H (3)	Date of the court's decision: Result (attach a copy of the court's opinion or order, if available): B) Did you receive a hearing on your motion, petition, or application? Yes No O
II	Date of the court's decision: Result (attach a copy of the court's opinion or order, if available): B) Did you receive a hearing on your motion, petition, or application? Yes
1 H	Date of the court's decision: Result (attach a copy of the court's opinion or order, if available): B) Did you receive a hearing on your motion, petition, or application? Yes
I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I	Date of the court's decision:
1 H	Date of the court's decision: Result (attach a copy of the court's opinion or order, if available): B) Did you receive a hearing on your motion, petition, or application? Yes
(66 N	Date of the court's decision:
1	Date of the court's decision:

	(7) If your answer to Question (c)(4) or Question (c)(5) is "No," explain why you did not appeal or
	raise this issue:
13	Is there any ground in this motion that you have <u>not</u> previously presented in some federal court
	If so, which ground or grounds have not been presented, and state your reasons for not
	presenting them:
	,
•	
14.	Do you have any motion, petition, or appeal now pending (filed and not decided yet) in any court
	for the judgment you are challenging? Yes \(\sigma\) No \(\sigma\)
	If "Yes," state the name and location of the court, the docket or case number, the type of
	proceeding, and the issues raised.
15.	Give the name and address, if known, of each attorney who represented you in the following
	stages of the judgment you are challenging:
	(a) At preliminary hearing:
. (b) At arraignment and plea:
_	
(c) At trial:
-	d) At sentencing:
`	

	(e) On appeal:
	(f) In any post-conviction proceeding:
	(g) On appeal from any ruling against you in a post-conviction proceeding:
16.	Were you sentenced on more than one count of an indictment, or on more than one indictment, in
	the same court and at the same time? Yes \square No \square
17.	Do you have any future sentence to serve after you complete the sentence for the judgment that you are challenging? Yes \(\subseteq No \subseteq \)
	(a) If so, give name and location of court that imposed the other sentence you will serve in the
	future:
	(b) Give the date the other sentence was imposed:
	(c) Give the length of the other sentence:
	(d) Have you filed, or do you plan to file, any motion, petition, or application that challenges the
	judgment or sentence to be served in the future? Yes \(\sigma\) No \(\sigma\)

must exp bar vour	lain why the one-year motion.*	statute of lim	itations as con	tained in 28 U.	S.C. § 2255 d	loes no
				,		
						_
					•	
	·					
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
	·					
						·
<u> </u>						
						
						
						 .
			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			

^{*} The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 ("AEDPA") as contained in 28 U.S.C. § 2255, paragraph 6, provides in part that:

A one-year period of limitation shall apply to a motion under this section. The limitation period shall run from the latest of —

⁽¹⁾ the date on which the judgment of conviction became final;

⁽²⁾ the date on which the impediment to making a motion created by governmental action in violation of the Constitution or laws of the United States is removed, if the movant was prevented from making such a motion by such governmental action;

⁽³⁾ the date on which the right asserted was initially recognized by the Supreme Court, if that right has been newly recognized by the Supreme Court and made retroactively applicable to cases on collateral review; or

⁽⁴⁾ the date on which the facts supporting the claim or claims presented could have been discovered through the exercise of due diligence.

* Please see attached following pages 15 thru 19

[Insert appropriate court]

GROUND FIVE: Ineffective assistance of appellate counsel for failure to submit a revised argument on SCOTUS remand

a) supporting facts

Appellate counsel failed to submit a revised argument after SCOTUS issued a g.v.r. that granted Movant's petition for certiorari, vacated the decision of the court below, and remanded the case for further proceedings in light of Burrage, the case that stands for the principle of law that imposition of Lwop (lifewithoutparole) sentences for convictions of drug trafficking causing death requires convictions of drug trafficking causing death requires proof that "but-for" the defendant's conduct, the proof that "but-for" the defendant's conduct, the patient would have lived. The government claimed patient would have lived an identical brief counsel menely resubmitted an identical brief counsel menely resubmitted an identical brief without arguing the legal insufficiency of without arguing the legal insufficiency of the evidence to sustain a LWOP.

GROUND SIX: Ineffective assistance of appellate counsel for failure to procure entire trial record

a) supporting facts

Counsel failed to order and review the transcripts of the closing arguments in which the government afformery repeatedly prejudiced the jury by asserting endentiary conclusions, including but not limited to repeated references to patients as customers and Movant's practice as a pill-mill.

GROUND SEVEN: Ineffective assistance of appellate counsel for failure to argue insufficiency of endence such that no reasonable jury could convict

a) supporting facts

The trial judge admitted no evidence of Movant's personal profit and stated that fact on the record. "Drugs for money" is an essential element of every drug trafficking felony under the Controlled Substances Act. Thus no reasonable jury could return a conviction of drug trafficking.

GROUND EIGHT: Abuse of discretion by Appellate Panel for failure to comply with Scotus g.v.r. order

a) supporting facts

The appellate panel abused its discretion by failing to provide meaningful further proceeding upon remand when it sustained and reimposed LWOP sentences on "contributory-to" testimony of government witnesses, when Scotus remand in light of Burrage required proof of "but-for" causation. Thus, as a matter of law, the appeals panel abused its discretion by sustaining a legally insufficient judgment.

GROUND NINE: The body of Movant is being held in illegal confinement because the federal court has failed to establish subject matter jurisdiction over him.

a) supporting facts

This court lacks subject matter jurisdiction over Movant because verifiable facts were never substantiated tending to prove prescription illegitimacy or pillmill/customer relationship rather than legitimate doctor/patient relationship. The illegitimacy of one or several prescriptions is the evidentiary trigger for federal jurisdiction over Movant's practice of médicine. The Controlled Substances Act exempts legitimate medical prescribing from drug trafficking liability and instead defers to police power of the state, except upon a showing of facts tending to prove prescription illegitimacy. Charges against Movant of over-prescribing were falsely substantiated by suborned perjury and unqualified experts, while compliance with state law, which is a reliable indicator of prescription legitimacy, was proven by a preponderance of the evidence.

> p.19 Paul Volkman VUSA 2255 motion